

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT SMART

FINAL SUMMARY

ANGELIKA PETROVIC

SMART collected training units for all relevant sectors of work in community radio. These training units are further geared to the specific needs of special target groups of the trainings. So these training units can also be used for radio training with vision impaired people, people with learning difficulties and migrant women. SMART is focusing on specific training situations and the distinct training framework that exists already within community media.

One partner was responsible for the evaluation of the project. Consulted by an expert for (Self)evaluation a concept was developed and carried out by COMMIT. The two core aspects of the Evaluation were:

- A. Evaluation of the process/development of the project
- B. Evaluation of the material and developed resources at the pilot training workshops

This final summary gives an overview on the applied evaluation activities, an estimation of the realization and a description of main conclusions regarding the project aims.

1. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

According to the evaluation concept which was agreed by all partners following evaluation activities should be realized:

- evaluation of every partner meeting with different feedback tools,
- online-evaluation with questionnaires between the meetings focussing the satisfaction of the last meeting, the individual work progress and the expectations and needs for the next meeting,
- need analysis with specific focus on the three different target groups,
- feedback and reporting form for the pilot trainings,
- examination of the pilot training reports and findings by use of a SWOT Analysis.

The products of these evaluation activities and the basis for this final summary are:

- written evaluation concept,
- documentation of the feedback activities and their main results after every partner meeting in form of evaluation reports,
- summary of the results of five online-evaluations,
- feedback form for the pilot trainings,
- pilot training reports,
- assessment of the pilot training reports by us of SWOT Analysis,
- need analysis report.

2. REALIZATION OF THE EVALUATION

For this project it was important to develop an evaluation concept which should monitor the process to support the coordination and assure the successful workflow of the project, bearing in mind that partners and involved people are spread all across Europe. So it turned out that methods for gathering information have to follow the project architecture (e.g meetings, time between meetings) and the structure.

In this project one partner was responsible for the evaluation so it can be seen as a form of self-evaluation. I think this was a very constructive form because the partner responsible for evaluation was involved in the project, is an expert of the project topics and could bring this knowledge about the process and the topic into the questions for the evaluation. To ensure the evaluation is done in a good way he was supported and consulted by an external expert. So all that knowledge could get combined. As another advantage can be seen the fact that the partners knew the person responsible for evaluation which might have lowered the risk to create a ambiance of control. The evaluation concept was introduced, discussed and agreed at the beginning of the project by all partners. That is also a very necessary point. One of the advantage of formative evaluation is, that results can be used for fine tuning the workflow or even decide on changes of the project plan if needed. Having this role of evaluation in mind partners are interested and willing to share information and even conflicting perspectives. No data – no conclusion! Further the data have to be described in time and passed over and get discussed. So the project coordinator also did a good job to be serious with the results of the surveys.

So in the end of the project it seems that the formative evaluation turned out as a good way to support the realization of a project. Specially in this project because all participants did a good job and committed to the evaluation.

3. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

- The evaluation was planned to support the project process and to help the coordinator leading through the project and finally to deliver all products in quality. Being spread all across Europe, combine daily work with the work for a project and in most cases to deal in a foreign language is a challenge that every partner had to handle and the coordinator had to make sure, that no one got frustrated. Answers in the questionnaire between the meetings confirm this common problems. In this project it could be dealt quite well, because the results of the questionnaire show that during most of the time the partners were satisfied and the amended points could be discussed and the coordinator knew, what the needs of the partner were.
- Though the satisfaction all in all was quite high and the project could realize its aims. It seems important to mention that in general for several partners it was not easy to keep in involved in the workflow during the meetings and further to be aware of every ones needs during the meetings as they were sometimes very different and even oppositional. Some answers showed, that appointments (skype, meetings) were

displaced. This should be avoided. Information in time and fixed meeting points are very important to ensure everyone to be able to plan the activities for the project.

- After the second partner meeting it was obviously that the curriculum should be split and separately discussed for each of the three target groups. The needs of the groups were too different that they could be summarized in one „guideline“. This was a big change towards the first project plan and meant that a) partners had to be flexible to recognize that a changing is usefully and ensures good and useful products and b) a common sense between the partners and the willingness to follow the changings became crucial. The results of the evaluation show that this sensitive point was managed good in the group. The products, the focussed curriculums seem to be very useful and sustainable!
- The online platform to share materials was partially overloaded and the amount of materials was frightening. It is mostly useful to have clear criteria for the materials to upload and an intuitive structure for filenames. Maybe it could be useful to have one responsible partner also for a kind of reviewing the material and making a systematic order.
- The pilot trainings all took place and as the SWOT Analysis shows a lot worked well and it seemed to be a good experience with huge learning effects. The results of the SWOT Analysis are very well documented and therefore the experiences made within the project are sustainable and able to disseminate. These documents also show very good the different needs of the three target groups and affirm the changing in the project plan to separate the curriculum. One interesting common result is that networking between the radio and the organisations accompanying the target group is very important and should be intensive. Maybe this could be a topic for a follow up project?
- The feedback form for the trainings was also developed. The answers confirm, similar to the SWOT analysis that the curriculum generally fits. It is also mentioned that a kind of following cooperation between the project consortium radio and the trainees should get prepared. Maybe also this aspect could be part of a follow up project?
- At the end of the project there was a lack of time and some activities were late and blocked others. This is unfortunately a well know phenomenon at it is hard to say how you generally can avoid this.

Angelika Petrovic

Researcher at BIFIE (Bundesinstitut für Bildungsforschung, Innovation und Entwicklung des österreichischen Schulwesens), lecturer and consultant for (Self)evaluation and freelancer

Muchargasse 28, 8010 Graz, angelika.petrovic@inode.at; +43(0)699 14085721